## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of : Attorney Docket No. 2006 1635A

Tamotsu YAMAMOTO et al. : Confirmation No. 6597

Serial No. 10/594,572 : Group Art Unit 3656

Filed September 27, 2006 : Examiner Daniel D. Yabut

ROTATING ASSEMBLY AND ITS MANUFACTURING METHOD

\_\_\_\_

## RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement set forth in the Office Action of June 24, 2010, the Applicants hereby elect the invention of Group I, drawn to a rotating assembly (corresponding to claims 1-4 and 11-19). In addition, the Applicants elect Species II, Figure 5a, and assert that claim 18 (as well as generic claims 1-15 and 19) read on elected Species II. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1-4, 11-15, 18, and 19 read on both the elected invention of Group I and elected Species II.

The Applicants also traverse the Examiner's *Species* Restriction Requirement for the following specific reasons.

Firstly, the Examiner's position that Figures 1-4 are directed to a separate Species I is incorrect. In particular, the Applicants submit that Figures 1-4 merely illustrate generic subject matter recited in *all* of the pending claims, and so the subject matter of each of claims 16-18 (as well as generic claims 1-15 and 19) reads on Figures 1-4. For example, the subject matter of Figures 1-4 is <u>not</u> mutually exclusive with respect to the subject matter of Figure 5a and claim 18, and so the subject matter of claim 18 necessarily also reads on the cam shaft illustrated in Figures 1-4. Thus, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the Species Restriction Requirement with respect to at least Species 1, Figures 1-4.

Furthermore, the Applicants also traverse the Species Restriction Requirement based on a lack of undue burden. In particular, the Applicants note that, due to the minimal number of different species identified by the Examiner, the *entire* application can be examined without any undue burden. Thus, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the entire Species Restriction Requirement.

In view of the above election and remarks, a favorable examination on the merits is now respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Tamotsu YAMAMOTO et al. /W. Douglas Hahm/ 2010.07.26 14:43:48

By \_\_\_-04'00'

W. Douglas Hahm Registration No. 44,142 Attorney for Applicants

WDH/kh Washington, D.C. 20005-1503 Telephone (202) 721-8200 Facsimile (202) 721-8250 July 26, 2010